



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Chap. iv ("Einiges über Wortstellung im Lateinischen") deals with cases where *et*, *etiam*, *quoque*, *autem*, *sed*, etc., seem to be misplaced; chap. v ("Über einige Pleonasmen") with certain pleonastic uses of prepositions and conjunctions. Chap. vi illustrates the use of *illi* for *illic*, and chap. vii is a discussion of the construction *κατὰ σύνεσιν*. Chap. viii ("Über einige sogenannte Gräzismen") deals especially with constructions that occur in late Latin, e.g., *ut* with the infinitive in O.O., *priusquam*, *tamquam*, *propter quod* with the infinitive, the infinitive=imperative, and the "Greek dative."

The last chapter is very suggestive. Among the topics discussed or touched upon are: the use of the subjunctive in clauses containing a verb of necessity, possibility, will, and the like; the present and perfect subjunctive in *quotiens*-clauses, in clauses introduced by *magis quam*, *quantum*, *quando*, *sicut*, *ubi*, etc. Especially interesting are the examples where the indicative and the subjunctive are found side by side without any apparent difference in meaning. Bährens rightly remarks that the study of the extent of the use of this "variatio" would be an extremely profitable investigation. The book deserves a more elaborate *Sach- und Wortindex* than the author has provided. A second index gives a list of the passages discussed.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Der Staat der alten Italiker.* Untersuchungen über die ursprüngliche Verfassung der Latiner, Osker, und Etrusker. Von A. ROSENBERG. Berlin, 1913. Pp. 142.

This book is an important and timely contribution to Roman constitutional history, and its arguments must be reckoned with even though they do not in every instance carry conviction. In the first chapter the author derives the Roman aedileship from Tusculum on the basis of *Eph. Epig.* ix. 680. His interpretation of the inscription is correct; however, this does not prove that the Tusculan institution was the source of the Roman. The position of the aedile of Furfo (*CIL.* i. 603) and of the Ostian *praetores et aediles sacris faciundis*, shows that village temple keepers (aediles) often acquired civil duties of importance in other Latian towns when those towns grew into large cities.<sup>1</sup> In other words, the civil aedileship was probably an early Latin institution found in many towns besides Tusculum.

The third chapter concludes from Oscan inscriptions that the early Italic censorship coincided with the regular duoviral magistracy of every *quinquennium*, i.e., that the *quinquennialitas* was the original censorial magistracy of Italy and that the separate censorship of Rome was therefore a new invention. His argument on this point seems to me convincing and of some importance. In chap. iv the author infers that the *quattuorvirate* of the

<sup>1</sup> This fact first recorded by Taylor (*Cults of Ostia*, 1912, p. 18) has now been reiterated by Kornemann (*Klio*, 1914, p. 194) in a review of Rosenberg.

Romans was derived from the octovirate of the Sabines. Here it is difficult to accept his conclusions. We have every reason to think that the tribal groups and village communities of Latium developed the city-state system several centuries before the Sabine clans did. The division of labor and specialization of magisterial functions in Latin city-states could not possibly have awaited the development of intricate political organizations in Sabium. In the face of this patent fact a nicely schematized hypothesis can hardly serve as argument to the contrary.

The chapter on the Etruscan magistracies is excellent and seems to prove that the magistrates of Etruscan cities were usually the *zilaχ* (a single officer corresponding to the "dictator" of Caere), the *marniu* (corresponding to the *aedilis* of Caere and the *maro* of Umbria), and the *purθne* (=quaestor, perhaps). The author seems to be correct in explaining the dictatorship of cities like Aricia, Lanuvium, and Nomentum as an old Etruscan institution.

Enough has been said to show that the author has brought new material to the discussion of Rome's constitutional forms; also that the discussion must be carried on farther.

TENNEY FRANK

---

*Tendenz, Aufbau und Quellen der Schrift vom Erhabenen.* Von HERMANN MUTSCHMANN. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. Pp. 113. M. 2.60.

Mutschmann seems to have taken his cue from a footnote in Otto's *Quaestiones selectae ad libellum qui est περὶ ὑψους spectantes*: "Sunt qui Pseudo-Longinum Theodori Gadareni sectatorem fuisse coniecerint, id quod tamen nemo adhuc accuratius studuit demonstrare." He divides his treatment into three parts corresponding to the three elements in the title. In the first (*Tendenz*), he presents the evidence for holding that the author of this treatise was opposed to Caecilius of Calacte in his rhetorical theory and that the contention between them did not grow out of mere whims of personal taste but was due to a difference in point of view such as is found in the case of members of opposing schools.

In the second part (*Aufbau*) he examines the structure of the treatise and shows that the author has mastered his material and arranged it in orderly fashion. He argues that the treatment of *πάθος* was deferred to a separate work because of its great importance and the limitations of space in the present work and that the apparent discrepancy between the summary at the end of the fifteenth chapter and the topics discussed in the preceding chapters is to be removed by making *σύνθεσις τῶν ἐμφερομένων* a subdivision under *μεγαλοφροσύνη* and by regarding the treatment of *αὔξις* as a part of the digression on Plato and Demosthenes.

In the third part (*Quellen*) he tries to show by comparisons based largely on the *Anonymus Sequerianus* (Cornutus) not only that the author was